IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	)
	)
Russell T. DAVIS et al.	) Group Art Unit: 2176
	)
Application No.: 10/052,250	)
	)
Filed: January 23, 2002	) Examiner: C. Nguyen
	)
For: RDX ENHANCEMENT OF	)
SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR	)
IMPLEMENTING REUSABLE	) Confirmation No.: 1920
DATA MARKUP LANGUAGE	)
(RDL)	)

Attention: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REPLY BRIEF

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.41(a)(1), Appellants present this Reply Brief in

response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on November 24, 2008.

I. Response to Examiner's Arguments in the Answer

In addition to the arguments for reversal of the outstanding final rejection provided in Appellants' Appeal Brief filed on August 28, 2008, Appellants provide the following remarks regarding the Examiner's Answer ("Answer") mailed on November 24, 2008.

Regarding the rejection of claims 62-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner continues to assert that the syntax elements in *Krug* correspond to the claimed "software elements" (Answer at pages 18-19). The Examiner states, "the HTML document is transformed into a syntax tree representing the hierarchical relationship of the syntax elements" (Answer at page 19). This is not correct.

In *Krug*, a syntax tree parser 20 "analyses the HTML syntax structure of the search result document by recognizing the HTML tags within the document and constructing a hierarchical HTML syntax tree that represents the hierarchical relationship of the syntax elements (tags)" (col. 8, lines 23-27). *Krug* specifically teaches that the syntax elements are the "tags" within the document (col. 8, line 27). By alleging that the syntax elements in *Krug* could somehow constitute the claimed "software elements," the Examiner is asserting that the tags in *Krug* correspond to <u>both</u> the claimed "tags" <u>and</u> the claimed "software elements." Therefore, according to the Examiner's statements, *Krug* interprets tags included in the document to create tags. This is not correct.

Krug analyzes the HTML syntax structure by recognizing tags and constructs a syntax tree that represents the hierarchical relationship of the tags. Neither the tags, syntax elements, nor any other teaching in *Krug* constitutes the claimed "software

elements" at least because *Krug* does not interpret "tags included in the one or more text documents to create software elements," as recited in independent claim 62. Accordingly, *Krug* also cannot teach or suggest determining "the hierarchy of the software elements within a structure representative of the one or more text documents," as further recited in claim 62.

The Examiner also continues to assert that *Hamscher* discloses the claimed "manager" that "provides for the creation of a second hierarchy of the software elements" and "provides for the restructuring of the first hierarchy and the second hierarchy into software structures corresponding to a new text document" (Answer at page 19). This is not correct.

According to page 17 of *Hamscher*, an XBRL instance document can be created by concatenating other XBRL instance documents. The Examiner appears to assert that an XBRL document created by concatenating other XBRL instance documents constitutes the claimed "second hierarchy of software elements." Even assuming that this newly created document could correspond to a "hierarchy of software elements," which Applicants do not concede, only <u>one</u> "hierarchy of software elements" would be created (i.e. the created XBRL document).

Both *Krug* and *Hamscher* disclose, at most, information in a <u>single</u> hierarchy (allegedly the hierarchical relationship in *Krug* and the created XBRL document in *Hamscher*). In contrast, claim 62 recites <u>both</u> the determination of a "hierarchy of <u>the software elements</u>" created by interpreting tags included in the one or more text documents" <u>and</u> "the creation of a second hierarchy of <u>the software elements</u>" (emphasis added). The cited references do not provide for <u>both</u> the determination of a

"hierarchy of the software elements" and the creation of a "second hierarchy" of the same "software elements," as recited by claim 62.

Therefore, *Hamscher* does not teach or suggest the claimed "creation of a second hierarchy of the software elements." Accordingly, *Hamscher* does not teach or suggest a manager that "provides for the creation of a second hierarchy between the software elements, and provides for the restructuring of the first hierarchy and the second hierarchy into software structures corresponding to a new text document," as recited in claim 62.

As set forth above, and contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, the combination of *Krug* and *Hamscher* does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 62. In view of this mischaracterization of the references, the Office Action has neither properly determined the scope and content of the prior art nor properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention. Therefore, no reason has been clearly articulated as to why the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in view of the prior art and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claim 62 is allowable for at least these reasons, and claims 63 and 64 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 62.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-6, 11-21, 24-34, 37-46, 49-57, and 59-61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner again relies on *Hamscher* to allegedly disclose "a manager that provides for the creation of a second hierarchical relationship between the software elements and the restructuring of the first hierarchical relationship and the

second hierarchical relationship into software structures corresponding to a new text document" (Answer at page 20). This is not correct.

As established above, *Hamscher* does not teach the claimed "creation of a second hierarchy of the software elements." Thus, *Hamscher* cannot teach or suggest a "manager that provides for the creation of a second hierarchy between the software elements and the restructuring of the first hierarchy and the second hierarchy into software structures corresponding to a new text document," as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, and contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, the combination of *Saxton, Polizzi*, and *Hamscher* does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 1. In view of this mischaracterization of the references, the Office Action has neither properly determined the scope and content of the prior art nor properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention. Therefore, no reason has been clearly articulated as to why the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in view of the prior art and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1.

Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons, and claims 2-6, and 11-16 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Independent claims 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54, though of different scope than claim 1, recite limitations similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claims 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above. Claims 18-21, 24-29, 31-34, 37-41, 43-46, 49-53, 55-57, and 59-61 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claims 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54 respectively.

Regarding the rejection of claims 8-10, 23, 36, 47, 48, and 58, which depend from claims 1, 17, 30, 42, and 54, Appellants continue to submit that *Clancey* does not cure the deficiencies of *Saxton*, *Polizzi*, and *Hamscher* for at least the reasons presented in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

II. Conclusion

For the reasons given above, and those reasons provided in Appellants' Appeal Brief, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims are in error and should be reversed.

If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed

herewith, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 22, 2009   By: _____
                                               Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
                                               Reg. No. 36,743